

REMARKS

These remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed July 16, 2003, indicating that the previous filed response was non-responsive.

Applicants submit that the claims are fully encompassed by the election made on August 23, 2002, electing claims consistent with Group I (claims 1-15, and 22-23), directed to a nonadhesive carboxylated latex product (as set forth in the Office Action mailed November 6, 2002). The claims currently pending clearly fall within the description set forth in the office action mailed November 6, 2002. The Examiner has not indicated why the claims do not fall within the description of the elected invention as described and set forth by the Examiner in the November, 6, 2002, Office Action. Thus there is no foundation for the Examiner's position that the claims are non-responsive and directed to a non-elected invention. For example, "A non-adhesive carboxylated latex product treated with a carboxyl-group blocking agent comprising a non-adhesive metal element crosslinking agent having three or more valences," (see, e.g., claim 1) clearly falls within the Examiner description of Group I as "a nonadhesive carboxylated latex product" (see, e.g., the Office Action mailed November 6, 2002). The amendments to claim 1 presented in the response filed May 2, 2003, were elements incorporated from original claim 9 (a claim of the elected invention of Group I).

Furthermore, original claim 1 was directed to a blend, original claim 2 was directed to a multilayer laminate structure, and original claim 3 was directed to a multilayer laminate structure. For example, claim 2 clearly recited a "surface-treatment" in the originally filed claim wherein the claim originally recited, "... having *a layer treated* with a carboxyl group ... on one or both *surfaces*..." Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 was part of Group I, which Applicants elected verbally and verified in writing in the response to the last office action filed May 2, 2003. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the original restriction set forth by the Examiner encompassed both blends and layered structures.

Applicants have amended the claims as set forth herein and believe the amendments are clearly within the scope of the Examiner's restriction to "a non-adhesive carboxylated latex product". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the non-responsive

Applicant : Koide, et al.
Serial No. : 09/997,467
Filed : November 28, 2001
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 13711-002001 / PH-963PCT-US-CIP


notification and examination of the claims currently pending. No new matter is believe to have been introduced by the foregoing amendments.

A response to the Office Action mailed July 16, 2003, was originally due on Saturday, August 16, 2003. The present response is being filed on Monday August 18, 2003, and thus is timely filed.. Accordingly, no fee is believed to be due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Date: _____

8/18/03

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph R. Baker, Jr.
Reg. No. 40,900

Fish & Richardson P.C.
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, California 92122
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099